

16 APR 1971

The Honorable James M. Hanley, Chairman
Subcommittee on Employees Benefits
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

My dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your letter of 1 April 1971 regarding certain bills to be taken up by your Subcommittee dealing with invasion of privacy of Federal employees. Your letter notes that these bills are similar in many respects to Senator Ervin's bill (S. 782) which passed the Senate last year.

As you may be aware, certain provisions of that bill directly conflicted with the statutory responsibilities of the Director of Central Intelligence for protecting intelligence sources and methods, and data relating to the organization of the Central Intelligence Agency. Insofar as these and similar provisions are incorporated in bills under consideration by the Subcommittee, we would urge that this Agency and its employees be fully exempted from the application of such legislation.

For your convenience, I am enclosing herewith copies of pertinent correspondence relating to the Ervin bill which I believe explain in part the reasons for our concern about the provisions in question.

My Legislative Counsel, Mr. John M. Maery, has been in touch with Messrs. Martiny and Barton, of the Committee staff, and either he or I will be happy to meet with you at your convenience to discuss the matter further.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

Richard Helms
Director

Enclosures

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

12 APR 1971

Mr. Wilfred H. Rommel
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D. C. 20503

Dear Mr. Rommel:

Per our phone conversation Friday, enclosed is a letter we have recently received from Chairman Hanley regarding an early hearing on legislation to protect the invasion of privacy of Federal employees. I am also enclosing copies of all material we had thought of sending Chairman Hanley in response to this letter providing you have no objection. This is essentially the same material on which you acted favorably last year. We have been in touch with John Martiny and Dick Barton, of the Committee staff, and they seem to appreciate our problem.

As you are probably aware, in the last session the Ervin bill was considered by Representative Henderson's Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service and we found him, and I believe a majority of his Subcommittee, quite sympathetic. However, consideration of this type of legislation in this session has been assigned to the Hanley Subcommittee on Employee Benefits and we are not sure just how he and most of the members of his Subcommittee view the matter. We hope to take some soundings in the near future.

In view of our concern over this problem, we would be grateful for any advice or assistance you can give us.

25X1A

Sincerely,

John M. Maury
Legislative Counsel

Enclosures

Distribution:

Original - Addressee

- 1 - DCI
- 1 - DDCI
- 1 - Ex Dir
- 1 - ER
- 1 - DDS
- 1 - OGC
- 1 - OLC w/basic - *subj*

Attachments to Hanley letter

30 June 1970 letter to Chairman Rivers from Chairman Henderson

24 June 1970 letter to Chairman Henderson from Chairman Rivers

18 June 1968 letter to Chairman Henderson from Chairman Rivers

30 June 1970 letter to Chairman Henderson from Chairman Mahon

2 July 1970 letter to Chairman Henderson from the Director